

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 5-6, and 10-16 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 5-6, 10-12, and 15 have been amended as indicated hereinabove.

Claims 2-4 and 7-9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 5-6, and 10-16 had been objected to. Claims 1, 10-11, and 15 have been amended to overcome these objections.

Claims 1, 5, and 13 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Nakane et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,374,972 (hereinafter Nakane). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Unless a publication discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the elements and limitations claimed but also all of the elements and limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.<sup>1</sup>

Claims 1, 5, and 13 comprise:

a first guide rotatable around a first rotational axis and defining a first offset axis parallel and at an offset to the first rotational axis,

a second guide rotatable around a second rotational axis and defining a second offset axis parallel and at an offset to the second rotational axis,

a third guide rotatable around a third rotational axis and defining a tilt axis at a non-zero angle to the third rotational axis, and

a carrier bearing the object, the carrier being rotatable around a carrier rotational axis at a non-zero angle to the object axis,

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the tilt axis, the third rotational axis is the second offset axis, and the second rotational axis is the first offset axis, or

---

<sup>1</sup> *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983))

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the second offset axis, the second rotational axis is the tilt axis, and the third rotational axis is the first offset axis, or

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the second offset axis, the second rotational axis is the first offset axis, and the first rotational axis is the tilt axis.

None of the elements of Claims 1, 5, and 13 are disclosed in Nakane. Therefore, Claims 1, 5, and 13 are novel and patentable over Nakane under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and should be allowed.

Claims 1, 5-6, 10-12, and 14-15 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Toyota et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,337,177 (hereinafter Toyota). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Unless a publication discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the elements and limitations claimed but also all of the elements and limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.<sup>2</sup>

None of the elements of Claims 1, 5-6, 10-12, and 14-15 are disclosed in Toyota. Therefore, Claims 1, 5-6, 10-12, and 14-15 are novel and patentable over Toyota under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and should be allowed.

Claims 1, 6, and 15 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Schalz et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,539,573 (hereinafter Schalz). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Unless a publication discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the elements and limitations claimed but also all of the elements and limitations

---

<sup>2</sup> *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983))

arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.<sup>3</sup>

None of the elements of Claims 1, 6, and 15 are disclosed in Schalz. Therefore, Claims 1, 6, and 15 are novel and patentable over Schalz under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and should be allowed.

Claim 1 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hopkins, U.S. Patent Number 3,994,557 (hereinafter Hopkins). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Unless a publication discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the elements and limitations claimed but also all of the elements and limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.<sup>4</sup>

Claim 1 comprises:

a first guide rotatable around a first rotational axis and defining a first offset axis parallel and at an offset to the first rotational axis,

a second guide rotatable around a second rotational axis and defining a second offset axis parallel and at an offset to the second rotational axis,

a third guide rotatable around a third rotational axis and defining a tilt axis at a non-zero angle to the third rotational axis, and

a carrier bearing the object, the carrier being rotatable around a carrier rotational axis at a non-zero angle to the object axis,

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the tilt axis, the third rotational axis is the second offset axis, and the second rotational axis is the first offset axis, or

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the second offset axis, the second rotational axis is the tilt axis, and the third rotational axis is the first offset axis, or

---

<sup>3</sup> *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983))

<sup>4</sup> *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983))

wherein the carrier rotational axis is the second offset axis, the second rotational axis is the first offset axis, and the first rotational axis is the tilt axis.

None of the elements of Claim 1 are disclosed in Hopkins. Therefore, Claim 1 is novel and patentable over Hopkins under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and should be allowed.

Claim 16 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Toyoda. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious.<sup>5</sup>

Claim 16 depends on Claim 15, which, as explained above, is patentable and, therefore, non-obvious. Therefore, Claim 16 is patentable over Toyoda under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and should be allowed.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited in this case. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HOUSTON ELISEEVA LLP

By           /Maria M. Eliseeva/          

Maria M. Eliseeva  
Registration No.: 43,328  
Tel.: 781 863 9991  
Fax: 781 863 9931

4 Militia Drive, Suite 4  
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4705  
Date: October 8, 2009

---

<sup>5</sup> *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)